

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 08/27/2003 10/648,364 Jean Prevost 9-13383-31US 3696 EXAMINER 20988 7590 03/29/2006 OGILVY RENAULT LLP SNIDER, THERESA T 1981 MCGILL COLLEGE AVENUE PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT **SUITE 1600** MONTREAL, QC H3A2Y3 1744 CANADA

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/648,364	PREVOST, JEAN	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Theresa T. Snider	1744	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apports. Preply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEMEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DOSING SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a) 🗌	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.			
Dispositi	on of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-5 and 10-13 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 6-9 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.			
Applicati	on Papers			
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on <u>27 August 2003</u> is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 1	a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected t drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) <u></u>	 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 			
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) be of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) contain Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) contain Date 8/27/2008	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa		

Application/Control Number: 10/648,364 Page 2

Art Unit: 1744

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-13, drawn to an apparatus, classified in class 15, subclass 397.

II. Claims 14-21, drawn to a method for treating turf, classified in class 134, subclass

42.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus can be used to aerator soil and plant seed.

- 3. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 4. During a telephone conversation with Jody Factor on 2/28/2006 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-13. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 14-21 withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/648,364 Page 3

Art Unit: 1744

Specification

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the title of the invention should be amended to reflect the elected invention.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

6. Claims 2-10 and 12-13 objected to because of the following informalities: claims 2-10 and 12-13, line 1, 'An' should be replaced with 'The'. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 8. Claims 1-2, 4-5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Pendergrass.

Pendergrass discloses a hollow cylinder including a plurality of hollow spikes extending radially and outwardly, each of the spikes having an orifice in fluid communication with an inner space within the cylinder (fig. 1, #11, fig. 3, #18).

Pendergrass discloses a support frame on which the cylinder is rotatably supported (fig. 1, #14).

Art Unit: 1744

Pendergrass discloses a pressurized fluid system for supplying fluid into the cylinder (fig. 1, #21).

With respect to claim 2, Pendergrass discloses the pressurized fluid system including a pressurized air source, a pressurized air distributor disposed in the cylinder and a line connecting the two (fig. 1, #21,22, fig. 2, #59).

With respect to claim 4, Pendergrass discloses a means for adjusting the height of the cylinder (col. 4, lines 25-27 and 29-31).

With respect to claim 5, Pendergrass discloses the air distributor including an air channel disposed parallel to a rotating axis of the cylinder (fig. 2, #23).

With respect to claim 10, Pendergrass discloses the support frame including a plurality of wheels (fig. 1, #25).

9. Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Waterman.

Waterman discloses a hollow cylinder including a plurality of hollow spikes extending radially and outwardly, each of the spikes having an orifice in fluid communication with an inner space within the cylinder (fig. 2, #10, 12.1).

Waterman discloses a support frame on which the cylinder is rotatably supported (fig. 2, #2).

Waterman discloses a pressurized fluid system for supplying fluid into the cylinder (col. 1, lines 36-38).

Art Unit: 1744

With respect to claim 11, Waterman discloses a vacuum system including means for separating particulate matter (col. 2, lines 11-14, a vacuum head connected to a vacuum cleaner known to have a filtering device).

With respect to claim 12, Waterman discloses an air channel disposed within the cylinder (fig. 2, unnumbered region within #11, #3).

With respect to claim 13, Waterman discloses means for adjusting the height of the cylinder (col. 2, lines 23-26).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 11. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 12. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pendergrass.

Pendergrass disclose a similar apparatus however fails to disclose a pressure controller.

Application/Control Number: 10/648,364 Page 6

Art Unit: 1744

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a pressure controller in Pendergrass to ensure that enough pressure is supplied to the cylinder to allow for effective penetration of a surface.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 13. Claims 6-9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 14. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

 The prior art discloses an apparatus having a hollow cylinder including a plurality of hollow spikes extending radially and outwardly, each of the spikes having an orifice in fluid communication with an inner space within the cylinder, a support frame on which the cylinder is rotatably supported, a pressurized fluid system for supplying fluid into the cylinder including a pressurized air source, a pressurized air distributor disposed in the cylinder and a line connecting the two HOWEVER fails to disclose or fairly suggest the further inclusion of a vacuum system.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hukuba discloses an apparatus have a spiked cylinder for use in suction material from a surface. Cady, Hanna, Steadman and Miksitz disclose apparatus with a hollow, spiked cylinder for supplying pressurized fluid to a surface.

Art Unit: 1744

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Theresa T. Snider whose telephone number is (571) 272-1277. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (5:30am-2:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gladys Corcoran can be reached on (571) 272-1214. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Theresa T. Snider Theresa 15. Inider

Primary Examiner Art Unit 1744

3/20/2006